1	Daniel R. Watkins				
2	Nevada State Bar No. 11881 DW@wl-llp.com				
3	Theresa M. Santos Nevada State Bar No. 9448				
	tsantos@wl-llp.com				
4	WATKINS & LETOFSKY, LLP 8215 S. Eastern Ave., Ste. 265				
5	Las Vegas, NV 89123				
6	Office:(702) 901-7553; Fax: (702) 974-1297 Attorneys for Plaintiff, Yessenia Iribe				
7	,				
8	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT			
9					
10	DISTRICT	OF NEVADA			
11	YESSENIA IRIBE,	Case No.: 2:20-cv-00417			
2	Plaintiff,				
13	vs.	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES			
4	NEVADA CREDICO INC.,	(DEMAND FOR HUDY EDIAL)			
	D/B/A/QUANTUM COLLECTIONS, a	(DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL)			
15	Nevada corporation; ALLIED COLLECTION SERVICES, INC., a Nevada corporation;				
16	AND DOES 1-50, inclusive,				
17					
18	Defendants.				
19	COMES NOW, Plaintiff, Yessenia Iribe (herein "PLAINTIFF") and files this civil actio				
20	against Defendants, and each of them, for violations of Title VII, 42 U.S.C 2000(e) et seq., Th				
21	American with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §12112 et seq., as well as violations under Nevad				
22	Revised Statutes §613.330 et seq.; and related claims under Nevada law, seeking damages, and				
23	alleges as follows:				
24	1. This Court has jurisdiction and venue over this action pursuant to Title VII, 42 U.S.C				
25	2000(e) et seq; the Americans with Disabilities	Act, 42 U.S.C. §12101 et seq., and 28 U.S.C. §§			
26	1331, 1343, 42 U.S.C. §2000e which confer original jurisdiction on federal district courts in suit				
27	to address the deprivation of rights, privileges and immunities secured by the United State				
28	Constitution and federal law.				

17

21

28

//

### 

#### **PARTIES**

#### **PLAINTIFF**

8. Plaintiff, YESSENIA IRIBE (hereinafter "Plaintiff"), was a qualified/eligible "employee" of Defendants, NEVADA CREDICO INC., d/b/a QUANTUM COLLECTIONS, and ALLIED COLLECTION SERVICES, INC., within the meaning of Nevada Revised Statutes \$608.010 and 613.010 et seq. and resided in Clark County, Nevada.

#### **DEFENDANTS**

- 9. Defendant, NEVADA CREDICO INC., (hereinafter "QUANTUM" or "Defendant") is a Nevada corporation, qualified to do business in Clark County. Defendant employs 15 or more employees and as such, is an "employer" within the meaning of Nevada Revised Statutes \$608.011 and 613.310. Defendant has offices located at 3080 S. Durango Dr., Las Vegas, Nevada 89117.
- 10. Defendant, ALLIED COLLECTION SERVICES, INC., (hereinafter "ALLIED" or "Defendant") is a Nevada corporation, qualified to do business in Clark County. Defendant employs 15 or more employees and as such, is an "employer" within the meaning of Nevada Revised Statutes §608.011 and 613.310. Defendant has offices located at 3080 S. Durango Dr., Las Vegas, Nevada 89117.
- 11. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of DOES 1 through 50, inclusive. The Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named Defendants are in some way responsible for, or participated in, or contributed to, the matters and things complained of herein, and is legally responsible in some manner. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint when the true names, capacities, participation and responsibilities have been ascertained.
- 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein mentioned, the defendants named in this action, as well as the fictitiously named defendants, and each of them, were agents and employees of the remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter complained of, were acting within the course and scope of such agency and/or employment and with the knowledge and consent of the remaining defendants.

1 STATEMENT OF FACTS 2 13. PLAINTIFF is a former employee of DEFENDANTS. She began working as a 3 collection's agent for DEFENDANTS on or about August 24, 2016. 4 14. DEFENDANT QUANTUM'S office was located on the first floor of a multi-story 5 office building. 6 7 15. DEFENDANT ALLIED'S office was located on the second floor of the same 8 building. 9 16. DEFENDANTS QUANTUM and ALLIED are owned by the same individual -10 Michael L. Feeney. 11 17. Plaintiff regularly moved between the first and second floors to complete her job 12 duties. 13 18. In approximately April 2018, supervisor Allison Smith, a white legal director, began 14 to harass PLAINTIFF about her race/national origin. Ms. Smith regularly made comments such 15 as, "I don't like you because you are Mexican" and "I don't trust you because you're Mexican." 16 19. PLAINTIFF learned that she was pregnant in June 2018. PLAINTIFF confided her 17 pregnancy in a fellow colleague. 18 20. Before PLAINTIFF formally announced her pregnancy, Allison Smith began making 19 comments to her that if she were to become pregnant, it would be "late in the game." Ms. Smith 20 also commented that she's "had about five abortions" and told PLAINTIFF that she could 21 terminate her pregnancy up to twenty-four weeks. 22 21. After PLAINTIFF announced her pregnancy, Allison Smith continued to make 23 harassing comments to Plaintiff about her pregnancy, such as "You're going to get fat and get 24 gestational diabetes." 25 22. PLAINTIFF was eventually diagnosed with gestational diabetes. 26 23. Because of her gestational diabetes, PLAINTIFF had to eat snacks often and take 27 frequent breaks in order to monitor her blood sugar.

28

//

- 24. Because of her pregnancy, PLAINTIFF used the restroom more frequently than non-pregnant employees.
- 25. PLAINTIFF requested an accommodation to eat more frequently and to use the restroom more frequently. DEFENDANTS granted these requests, but supervisor Allison Smith regularly interrupted these breaks and required PLAINTIFF to return to work.
- 26. Supervisor Allison Smith regularly harassed PLAINTIFF by chastising her for taking too many breaks and calling to the other floor to ensure that PLAINTIFF was working.
- 27. Shortly after PLAINTIFF announced her pregnancy, DEFENDANTS changed PLAINTIFF's bonus structure, which caused her to earn less income.
- 28. DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF to provide leave requests for doctor's appointments with her OBGYN two weeks in advance.
- 29. PLAINTIFF complied with DEFENDANTS' two week advance notice request, but DEFENDANTS failed to accommodate PLAINTIFF's request to attend appointments with her physician.
- 30. Supervisor Allison Smith continued to harass PLAINTIFF throughout January 2019, with comments such as, "Is pregnancy making you dumb?" and "Are you being hormonal?"
- 31. PLAINTIFF reported Ms. Smith's harassing and discriminatory conduct to Defendant Quantum's co-owners Chad Tomolo and Jeff Mancini, who indicated to PLAINTIFF that they discussed the matter with Michael L. Feeney.
  - 32. PLAINTIFF requested that she be assigned a new supervisor.
- 33. Neither Michael L. Feeney, nor any of the other owners, took any affirmative action to curb the harassing and discriminatory conduct by Allison Smith.
  - 34. PLAINTIFF delivered her baby on February 3, 2019.
- 35. When PLAINTIFF learned that Allison Smith would still be her supervisor upon her return from maternity leave, PLAINTIFF constructively discharged her employment.
- 36. The despicable tactics of DEFENDANTS caused a substantial burden to PLAINTIFF'S rights and caused PLAINTIFF to suffer significant emotional distress, embarrassment, and humiliation, in addition to financial loss.

1 COUNT I 2 TITLE VII - DISCRIMINATION 3 (RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, AND NATIONAL ORIGIN) 4 Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. §2000e et seq.) 5 Title VII - Civil Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. §1981 et seq.) 6 NV Rev. Stat. § 613.330 et seq. 7 37. PLAINTIFF hereby incorporates paragraphs 1 through 36 of this Complaint as 8 though fully set forth herein. 9 38. During the course of PLAINTIFF'S employment with DEFENDANTS, 10 DEFENDANTS, by and through their agents and employees, discriminated against PLAINTIFF 11 in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment in various ways, in substantial part 12 because of her race, color, religion, and/or national origin, in violation of Title VII of the Civil 13 Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §2000e et. seq. 14 39. DEFENDANT'S unlawful discrimination against PLAINTIFF included treating 15 PLAINTIFF differently based on her race, color, religion, and/or national origin related to 16 employment, including recruitment, hiring, assignments, discipline, promotion, and benefits. 17 40. Specifically, the disparate treatment included frequently repeated comments by 18 PLAINTIFF'S supervisor that she did not like PLAINTIFF because she was "Mexican" and that 19 she did not trust PLAINTIFF because she was "Mexican." 20 41. PLAINTIFF'S race, color, religion, and/or national origin were either the sole reason 21 or a motivating factor for DEFENDANTS' decision to harass PLAINTIFF. 22 42. As a proximate result of DEFENDANTS' discriminatory actions, PLAINTIFF has 23 suffered losses in compensation, earning capacity, humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional 24 distress. As a result of those actions and consequent harms, PLAINTIFF has suffered such 25 damages in an amount to be proved at trial. 26 27 28

- 43. DEFENDANTS, through their agents or supervisors failed to adequately supervise, control, discipline, and/or otherwise penalize the conduct, acts, and failures to act of DEFENDANTS and their supervisors and Human Resources Department as described above thereby ratifying the unlawful conduct of its supervisors and Human Resources Department.
- 44. DEFENDANTS' unlawful actions were intentional, willful, malicious and/or done with reckless disregard for Plaintiff's federally protected rights.
  - 45. Plaintiff requests relief as described in the Prayer for Relief below.

#### **COUNT II**

#### **SEX (GENDER) DISCRIMINATION**

42 U.S.C. §2000(e) et seq.

NV Rev. Stat. §613.330 et seq.

- 46. PLAINTIFF hereby incorporates paragraphs 1 through 45 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 47. The subjection of PLAINTIFF to disparate treatment and adverse employment actions by DEFENDANTS in whole or substantial part because of her sex (female, pregnant) was in violation of 42 U.S.C. §2000(e) et seq.
- 48. DEFENDANTS' violation of 42 U.S.C.§2000(e) et seq. was intentional, willful and deliberate and Plaintiff seeks liquidated damages for each violation.
- 49. DEFENDANTS' unlawful actions were intentional, willful, malicious and/or done with reckless disregard for PLAINTIFF'S statutorily protected rights.
- 50. DEFENDANTS, through their agents or supervisors, failed to adequately supervise, control, discipline, and/or otherwise penalize the conduct, acts, and failures to act of DEFENDANT as described above and thereby ratified the unlawful conduct of its agents or supervisors.
- 51. As a direct and proximate result of DEFENDANTS' discriminatory actions as alleged herein, PLAINTIFF has been made to suffer mental anguish and emotional distress, loss of employment and future employment opportunities, and loss of wages and benefits. Plaintiff is reasonably certain to continue to suffer these damages in the future.

28

52. As a result of DEFENDANTS' conduct, PLAINTIFF requests relief as described in the Prayer for Relief below.

#### **COUNT III**

## INTERFERENCE AND DISCRIMINATION WITH AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. §12101 et seq.)

NV Rev. Stat. §613.330 et seq.

#### (Against All Defendants)

- 53. PLAINTIFF hereby incorporates paragraphs 1 through 52 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 54. At all times material hereto, PLAINTIFF was an employee covered by and within the meaning of Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) 42 USC 12111(4)).
- 55. At all times material hereto, PLAINTIFF was and is an individual with a disability within the meaning of §3(2) of the ADA, 42 USC 12102(2).
- 56. PLAINTIFF was a qualified individual with a disability as that term is defined in the ADA, 42 USC 12111(8).
- 57. PLAINTIFF'S pregnancy was a physical impairment that substantially limited one or more major life activities.
  - 58. DEFENDANTS were aware that PLAINTIFF was pregnant.
- 59. PLAINTIFF'S disability, and/or record of a disability, and/or perceived disability was a factor that made a difference in DEFENDANTS' decision change her bonus structure.
- 60. PLAINTIFF'S disability was a factor that made a difference in DEFENDANTS' refusal to excuse her to attend appointments with her physician.
- 61. The actions of DEFENDANTS were intentional and willful, in deliberate disregard of and with reckless indifference to the rights and sensibilities of PLAINTIFF
- 62. As a direct and proximate result of DEFENDANTS' violation of PLAINTIFF'S rights as alleged, PLAINTIFF'S terms, conditions, and privileges of employment were adversely affected.

63. As a direct and proximate result of DEFENDANTS' wrongful acts and omissions, PLAINTIFF has sustained injuries and damages including but not limited to, loss of earnings and earning capacity; loss of career opportunities; loss of fringe benefits; mental anguish, physical and emotional distress; humiliation and embarrassment; loss of the ordinary pleasures of everyday life, including the right to pursue the gainful employment of her choice.

64. PLAINTIFF requests relief as described in the Prayer for Relief below.

#### **COUNT IV**

#### **DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION – FAILURE TO ACCOMMODATE**

Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. §12101 et seq.)

NV Rev. Stat. §613.330 et seq.

#### (Against All Defendants)

- 65. PLAINTIFF hereby incorporates paragraphs 1 through 64 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 66. The Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §12101, et. seq., prohibits employers from discriminating against qualified individuals because of a disability "in regard to job application procedures, the hiring, advancement, or discharge of employees, employee compensation, job training, and other terms, conditions, and privileges of employment." (42 U.S.C. §12112).
- 67. PLAINTIFF had a disability within the meaning of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA"). A "disability" under the ADA is a physical or mental impairment or being regarded as having a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of such individual. The terms disability and physical or mental impairment include (1) any physiological disorder, or condition affecting one or more of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, and others; or (2) any mental or phychological disorder such as emotional or mental illnesses, among others.
- 68. PLAINTIFF was a qualified individual, meaning an individual with a disability who, with or without a reasonable accommodation, can perform the essential functions of the employment position that such individual holds or desires. At all times during her employment,

1 COUNT V 2 **HOSTILE WORK ENVIRONMENT** 3 Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. §2000e et seq.) 4 Title VII - Civil Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. §1981 et seq.) 5 NV Rev. Stat. §613.330 et seq. 6 (Against All Defendants) 7 77. PLAINTIFF hereby incorporates paragraphs 1 through 76 of this Complaint as 8 though fully set forth herein. 9 78. PLAINTIFF was subjected to verbal comments regarding her pregnant condition 10 during her employment with DEFENDANTS which was perpetrated upon her by 11 DEFENDANTS, and that this conduct was based upon and directed at PLAINTIFF by reason of 12 her sex (female, pregnant). 13 79. The conduct was unwelcome. 14 80. The conduct was sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the conditions of 15 PLAINTIFF'S employment and create an abusive and/or hostile work environment; 16 81. This harassing and discriminatory conduct was sufficiently severe and pervasive so as 17 to unreasonably interfere with PLAINTIFF'S physical health, work performance and so as to 18 create an intimidating, hostile and offensive working environment. 19 82. Plaintiff perceived the working environment to be abusive or hostile. 20 83. During the times referenced herein, PLAINTIFF was subject to a number of 21 inappropriate comments made by her supervisor, Allison Smith. These comments included, but 22 were not limited to, remarks that PLAINTIFF was too old to have a baby, that it wasn't too late 23 for PLAINTIFF to have an abortion, that PLAINTIFF was going to get fat and get gestational 24 diabetes, and that pregnancy was making PLAINTIFF dumb. 25 84. As a direct and proximate result of the harassing and hostile environment of 26 DEFENDANTS and her supervisors, PLAINTFF suffered great embarrassment, humiliation and 27 mental and physical anguish. 28 //

**REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL** Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 38(b) and 42 U.S.C. §1981a, Plaintiff demands a trial by jury in this action on all issues so triable. DATED this 28<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2020. WATKINS & LETOFSKY, LLP /s/ Daniel R. Watkins By: Daniel R. Watkins Theresa M. Santos 8215 S. Eastern Ave., Ste. 265 Las Vegas, NV 89123 Attorneys for Plaintiff, Yessenia Iribe 

# **EXHIBIT 1**

Notice of Right to Sue

EEOC Form 161-B (11/16)

## U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

## NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE (ISSUED ON REQUEST)

To: Yess	enia Iribe	From:	Los Angeles District ( 255 E. Temple St. 4th Los Angeles, CA 9001	Floor
	On behalf of person(s) aggrieved who CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR §1601.7(a)			
EEOC Charg	ge No.	EEOC Representative		Telephone No.
		Karrie L. Maeda,		SSECTION OF ENGINEERS AND
34B-2019-	-01259	State & Local Coordinator		(213) 894-1100
Notice to Ti	E PERSON AGGRIEVED:	(See also	the additional information	enclosed with this form.)
Act (GINA): been issued of your rece	This is your Notice of Right to Sue, at your request. Your lawsuit unde	mericans with Disabilities Act (ADA), issued under Title VII, the ADA or GINA r Title VII, the ADA or GINA must be figue based on this charge will be lost. (Total Control of the control	A based on the above-nur led in a federal or state of	nbered charge. It has
	More than 180 days have passed	since the filing of this charge.		
X	Less than 180 days have passed be able to complete its administra	since the filing of this charge, but I have tive processing within 180 days from th	e determined that it is unlil e filing of this charge.	cely that the EEOC will
X	The EEOC is terminating its proce			
	The EEOC will continue to proces	ss this charge.		
Age Discrim 90 days after your case:	The EEOC is closing your case. 90 DAYS of your receipt of this	A): You may sue under the ADEA at an ompleted action on the charge. In this retained in the ADEA action on the charge. In this retained in the ADEA notice. Otherwise, your right to sue bases	egard, the paragraph ma must be filed in federal ased on the above-numbe	rked below applies to or state court <u>WITHIN</u> red charge will be lost.
	you may file suit in federal or state	ng of your ADEA case. However, if 60 e court under the ADEA at this time.	days have passed since the	he filing of the charge,
n federal or s	tate court within 2 years (3 years for	nt to sue under the EPA (filing an EEOC or willful violations) of the alleged EPA und rs (3 years) before you file suit may r	derpayment. This means t	PA suits must be brought hat backpay due for
f you file suit,	based on this charge, please send	a copy of your court complaint to this offi	ce.	
		On behalf of the Gor		nuary 16, 2020
Enclosures(s	<u> </u>	Rosa M. Viramontes, District Director		(Date Mailed)
P A C 30	lichael Feeney resident LLIED COLLECTION SERVICES, OLLECTIONS 080 S. Durango Dr., Ste. 208 as Vegas, NV 89117	INC. DBA QUANTUM		